



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

. . . The total foreign trade of the three leading commercial nations of the world is now for Great Britain 3,573 millions of dollars, for the United States 2,258 millions and for Germany 2,254 millions.

. . . William H. Seward once said: "There is reason, there is sound political wisdom in this provision of the Constitution excluding colonies, which are always subject to oppression, and excluding provinces, which always tend to corrupt and ultimately to break down the parent state."

. . . "What, indeed, is true civilization? By its fruit you shall know it. It is not dominion, wealth, material luxury — nay, not even a great literature and education widespread, good though these things be. Civilization is not a veneer; it must penetrate to the very heart and core of societies of men. Its true signs are thought for the poor and suffering, chivalrous regard and respect for women, the frank recognition of human brotherhood, irrespective of race or color or nation or religion; the narrowing of the domain of mere force as a governing factor in the world, the love of ordered freedom, abhorrence of what is mean and cruel and vile, ceaseless devotion to the claims of justice. Civilization in that, its true, its highest sense, must make for Peace." — *Lord Russell of Killowen*.

"Worse Things Than War!"

Worse things than war! O breathe it not to me,
That aught on earth more terrible can be!
That men their noble talents should bestow
With dire effect to lay their brethren low!

Worse things than war! Is human blood so cheap
That we therefrom may plenteous harvest reap?
Is tenderness of heart so rare a thing
Men can rejoice in human suffering?

Worse things than war! If fiends were set at large,
Well might they glory in "*a splendid charge!*"
With lance in rest, and all their soul on fire,
How would they dash through mingled blood and mire!

Worse things than war! These deeds of madness came
From lust of power, and thirst for worldly fame!
Heard ye that crash? 'T was but a bursting shell
That 'mid the homes of peaceful mortals fell!

Worse things than war! What do I now behold?
More awful scenes than can in words be told!
Dismembered bodies gasping yet for breath,
And wounds that mean protracted living death!

Worse things than war! Where, Virtue, where art thou?
Nor sex nor age can hope for mercy now!
'T were vain to plead for grace in Pity's name,
When lust of victory doth its victims claim!

Worse things than war! Well may we kneel to pray,
That from this world such scenes may pass away!
Should not all nations for this end combine,
And round the Saviour's brows their laurels twine?

— *Wm. Kitching*.

Attitude of Women Toward the International Peace Movement.

ADDRESS OF MRS. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER AT THE
ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE AMERICAN PEACE
SOCIETY, MAY 18.

Friends:

I have been asked to say a word to-night as to the attitude of women toward the peace question. I have no desire to divide the sentiment of men and women on this or any other question, but it is of some importance and interest to know that the two greatest organizations of women of international character which the world holds to-day are both committed to peace as an active propaganda, and as the most uniting of all the chords of sentiment and ideal which they strike. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in its world association, has a very active peace department. That larger body of women, which is much more representative of all the interests of modern womanhood, the International Council of Women, composed of the National Councils of seventeen different countries, has united upon universal peace and international arbitration as the one point of common appeal, common sympathy, and united effort. Near the date at which this meeting is held, in the seventeen different countries represented in the International Council there will be held countless meetings for the propagation of the peace idea, under the auspices of the national and local councils; as was the case in May of last year.

It certainly means something when the women of all the world, so far as the civilized and more advanced countries are concerned, can come together and say: "Though we may differ in our religious emphasis and statement, so that we cannot pass a resolution involving any theological belief; though we may differ in our view as to the proper position of woman in the State, so that suffragists and anti-suffragists cannot unite; though we may differ in our attitude toward the matter of personal habit, such as is enforced by the W. C. T. U., so that we cannot pass any distinctively temperance resolution involving a method of applying the principles, — though we may differ upon many questions, upon this one we stand united! As women we are tired of bringing forth sons for slaughter on battlefields! [Applause.] As women we see clearly — perhaps in a more intimate and peculiar manner than the ordinary man can comprehend — the sacredness and the cost of a human life. We are no longer ready to respond to the calls for larger armies and bigger navies, which mean more men set apart, not alone for possible or positive destruction of body, but too often for the demoralization of character and lowering of ideals.

I recently heard read in a public meeting selections from a book published in Germany, which gave minute instructions to young men entering the army. One of the most vital sentences, beginning a long chapter of instruction as to the way in which the young soldier should look upon his future work as an officer of the army, was like this — the substance burned itself into my consciousness too deeply for misquotation in its essence: "You will have to leave behind you the moral ideals of civil life." What does that mean? That the

soldier must leave behind him, in the first place, the ideal of the sacredness of a human life. That which would be murder in the ordinary relations of the family, society and the state, at home and in peace, must become to him a badge of distinction in its execution on the battlefield. The ideal of forming himself to be, along with his equipment, a more and more dangerous engine of destruction — that must be the ideal cherished by him! We have recently been shown by a striking and graphic illustration in Germany what the spirit of militarism is when it reaches its culmination. Its arrogance becomes so overmastering that it is counted an honorable and proper thing to kill a subordinate officer who is not sufficiently deferential to his chief!

The women of the different countries who have joined together in international relationship have come to feel that on this one point they may touch a chord that may help to bind the world together in a different attitude. They may help to say all together in one form or another: "We will not set apart any body of men who shall be obliged to turn their backs upon the moral ideals which we have wrought out with such effort to help us in our living together in peace and in the ordinary relations of life. This is too great a sacrifice."

The horrors of war may be dwelt upon, but these are not the things that chiefly affect me in my thought of this whole question. There are certain things that are worse than death, worse than bloodshed, worse than slaughter. One such thing is to live unharmed, and be willing to accept an ignoble position; to live safe and comfortable, while those things that are more precious than life are wasted with the prodigality of the immoral impulse. There is that about the military spirit itself which is infinitely worse, to my conception, than the raking of the guns across the earth, or the last heart-beat of a million soldiers on a thousand fields. There is that in the military spirit which treads upon everything that is ideal, everything that is delicate, everything that is humane, everything that distinguishes the human race in its higher life from the human race in its lower life, or the savage beast below the human. The greatest evil is in the military spirit itself; in the idealization of force as the settler of disputes, as the arbiter of destiny. It is *that* which is worse than any of its effects, infinitely worse, and some of us have felt during the last few years in America that we were suffering from reversion to a lower type in this respect here in this country.

It would have seemed incredible to any one in this audience, I am sure, ten years ago, that we should begin again to deify the soldier, and put the conqueror upon a pedestal not only for deference, but even for moral admiration, that we should place again the man of military achievement as the ideal hero before our children. I cannot believe that this is anything but a passing phase. I cannot believe that we shall continue to place our reliance here in America upon armies and navies. I cannot believe that we shall so far lose sight of that which has made our chief glory and our greatest opportunity in the past, our peaceful and fraternal attitude toward all the world. I cannot believe that we have outgrown that in this new craze for military expansion. What kind of expansion do we want? What kind are we achieving, if we will only not becloud it and confuse it by this mili-

tarism recently awakened? We are making our name felt and our influence felt throughout the world.

I heard a pathetic story told by a Hindu woman not long ago. From the zenanas, she said, the high caste women stole at night to ask an American woman to tell them stories of a country in which women were free and respected, and the mothers of the race were held in honor in a different sense from what those Hindu women knew in their own land. That was an expansion of an idea. If that missionary woman had had a gun in her hand, and had said, "Accept the domination of my country, or I cannot show you what womanhood is in a land of freedom," would there have been any stealing out of the zenana in the dead of night to get that touch of light from another land?

What has been the expansion we have had? It has been a thrilling impulse of freedom! Shall we imperil it for the sake of having a few costly vessels of war, that a new change, a perhaps rapid change, in invention will make absolutely worthless in a year or two?

Just think for a minute what we have to do in this country. We are spending a hundred millions of dollars a year in charity. And we ask: "Is this to be a perpetual expense?" Why are so many people incompetent to self-support? We find that a third are so because of ill health, weakness, disease, or accident. We are finding out again that the reasons for the greater amount of the disease among the poorer class of people are bad homes and unsanitary environment. Three hundred thousand dark rooms in the city of New York alone, and the slums of other cities emulating that dreadful condition! We are finding out that if we can only apply the proper machinery we can surround the children who are born even into the slums of the cities with a better life and better chances. But this costs money. We are finding out that that dread white terror, tuberculosis, which kills so many people, can be held in leash. But it takes money to provide better homes, opportunities, sanitariums, etc.

We are trying again to see how we can get rid of another great item of expense. It costs us over sixty millions of dollars a year for our penal system, exclusive of the income from the plants of the great prisons and reformatories, and the fees and fines we receive back. We have found that eighty per cent of our criminals can be reformed and set back again into right relations to society. And when we ask, Why is it that they need reforming? we find it is because the boys have not breathing-places enough, and their misplaced energy is dammed up to the danger point, and must burst forth. We find we are letting social evils flourish, so that young life is corrupt before it understands the difference between vice and virtue.

We could count for hours the great tasks laid upon our own people here in America, tasks that belong to regeneration, to uplift, to the building up of life. And why can we not do them more rapidly and more perfectly? For two reasons:

One is because we are always needing more money for schools, more money for enlightened social work, and we are using up the most precious lives we have, the lives of people who are born to direct these agencies for social regeneration, in sending them around begging for

money to do their work with — the most costly misuse of human life we are engaged in. And then we talk about having plenty of money for army and navy, for military show, for the pomp and circumstance of mimic or real war!

But deeper than lack of money is the lack of faith in the developing power of moral influences and agencies. People are recreant to the ideals of human life that Emerson, whose name we are frequently taking upon our lips at this time, preached to us. We do not believe what Channing said: "Every human soul is sacred, unspeakably so, and therefore every child has a right to the best development society can afford." It is because we do not believe these things as we should that we are indifferent, and the money does not come for the real uplifting agencies, but goes for destruction and then for patching and mending.

And why do we not believe in moral forces? It is because many of us have not learned that they are the only real forces. If you put a hand upon a human being, or a nation puts its hand upon another nation, to hold that human being or to hold that nation by artificial pressure, you have done absolutely nothing to that human being and nothing to that nation to elevate them, no matter what superficial advantages you may have offered to them or they may have accepted. Only when there is a response from within can there be growth, and it is moral forces alone that win this response. These are truisms, but if we believed them we could regenerate the world! [Applause.]

A Horrid Dream.

Address of Governor Garvin at the recent dedication of the Rhode Island monument at Andersonville.

The memories aroused by this spot are sad ones, but the occasion itself calls for the deepest gratitude. We may indeed be thankful to meet here, in an unbroken nation — as brothers, once estranged, but now knit together in the bonds of a common history and a common destiny.

Those of us who, on either side, participated in the Civil War, look back upon it as a horrid dream. We wonder that a self-governing people could have been so irrational and so hard-hearted as to try to settle their differences by the arbitrament of war.

The four bloody years serve to remind us how small an advance our boasted civilization has made from barbarism, — how little, indeed, we have risen above the brutes.

A few generations ago dueling was regarded in the same light that war now is. When two acquaintances had a difference, the code of honor permitted, and under some circumstances was thought to compel, them to meet in mortal combat. Yet, looking back upon the proceeding, in what respect did it differ, in morals or in its effects, from any street brawl? In what way would it have been worse for Alexander Hamilton, his friends or his country, had he been done to death by a burglar, instead of a political opponent?

To go upon the field of honor — God save the mark — for the purpose and with the intent to kill another is murder in the first degree, even though that other is

equally armed and equally bent upon destruction. The whole procedure is irrational, savage, brutal.

War is dueling writ large. Although we do not as yet see it, to settle a dispute by the method of war, or to class its declaration with other ways of arriving at international agreement, is to place all who are responsible therefor upon a level with the wild beasts, and the individual who is most responsible needs courage only to make him a modern Nero.

Brutal itself, every war begets a brood of cruelties. Weyler's reconcentrado policy in Cuba aroused our people to a high pitch of righteous indignation. Had we then been charged with being equally inhuman, our answer in all sincerity would have been: "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?" And yet within two years we had adopted a similar policy in the Philippines, and had added to the Spanish ferocity the "water cure" and the giving of no quarter.

About the same time a still more destructive reconcentrado policy was adopted by the mighty British empire in dealing with the Boers of South Africa.

In the opinion of the Southern people, the devastation by the Northern army in the Shenandoah Valley and in Sherman's march to the sea was unnecessary and inexorable. So thought the North of the sufferings of prisoners here in Andersonville.

Indeed, when a nation embarks upon the work of slaughter, has staked success, and, it may be, its very existence upon the decision of the battlefield, any laws of war — which in their nature are arbitrary — have but slight binding force upon either combatant. In a business where murder, arson, robbery and fraud are counted as virtues, receiving the highest praise and the greatest reward, it certainly is a fine distinction to say that prisoners should be well treated, and that non-combatants, together with their property, should be protected.

The veterans of the Civil War have, I believe, been conservators of peace; assuredly this is true of the rank and file. After witnessing the ravages of the march and the carnage of the battlefield, they were ready to echo the words of General Sherman, "War is hell."

Unlike a volunteer soldiery, a standing army is a continual menace to the pursuits of peace. Regular officers, so far as their influence extends, are fomenters of war, ever ready to transmute the smiling face of nature into war's horrid visage. Again, the civil department of our national government, with whom the power to declare war rests, has on many occasions shown itself only too ready to second in this respect the wishes of the military branch.

I have long wished that the presidents and the congressmen who are in haste to enter upon an unnecessary or aggressive war could be compelled to go upon the firing line. No doubt if such a requirement existed, peace would be perpetual, since these verbal fire-eaters, as a rule, take precious good care to keep themselves at a safe distance from the hum of shot and shell.

The war between the states sprang directly from an incompetent and misrepresentative Congress. Nobody now desires the reestablishment of slavery, and the inherent viciousness of that institution might and would, under wise leadership, have been recognized and ended without a bloody emancipation.